

**SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW**

Applicants thank Examiners Vu and Soni for being available for, and participating in, a telephonic interview that occurred on November 27, 2007 in which the Applicants' representatives discussed the differences between the claimed invention and U.S. Patent No. 5,182,744 to Askew et al. (hereinafter the "Askew reference") cited in support of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1, 11, and 14. During the discussion, the Applicants' representatives addressed two proposed amendments that clarified the how traffic flow was used to determine a priority order of the nodes in a network. Examiner Vu stated that these amendments may be helpful in distinguishing the Applicants' claimed invention from the Askew reference. In particular, it was indicated by Examiner Vu that the claim language of "geographic locations linked by the connection" will likely put the independent claims in condition to overcome the present § 103(a) obviousness rejection.